


Appl'n No. 10/602,777

Responsive Amendment dated February 6, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 10/602,777
Applicant : Scott A. Moskowitz
Filed : June 25, 2003
TC/A.U. : 2132
Examiner : Laurel L. LASHLEY
Docket No. : 80391.0003

Confirmation No. 2233

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT/REPLY

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of November 6, 2006 Applicant provides the following remarks:

Appl'n No. 10/602,777
Responsive Amendment dated February 6, 2007
Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2006

Response to Restriction Requirement

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: 1) The inventions must be independent; and, 2) There must be a serious burden on the examiner to examine the additional inventions. See MPEP 803.

In response to the Office Action of November 6, 2006, Applicant provisionally elects to prosecute the claims in Group I (namely, Claims 6-21, 30-31, with traverse.